



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M No.11568 of 2026
Date of decision: 20.04.2026**

Tejinder Pal Singh Sandhu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. H.P.S. Rahi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.355 dated 21.11.2025 registered under Sections 406 and 420 IPC [Sections 316(2), 318(4) BNS] at Police Station Civil Lines, Batala, District Batala, Punjab.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and the allegations, even if taken at their face value, do not disclose the commission of any offence against him. The entire dispute essentially arises out of monetary transactions allegedly made for sending a person abroad, however, the material placed on record, including bank transactions, would show that no amount was ever received by the petitioner and rather the payments were



made to other persons. The petitioner was not even present in India at the relevant time when the alleged cash transaction is stated to have taken place, which falsifies the very substratum of the prosecution story. There are inherent contradictions in the FIR itself regarding the mode and timing of payment; that there is an unexplained and inordinate delay in lodging the FIR, which casts serious doubt on the veracity of the allegations. The allegations regarding non-renewal of passport and incomplete process further demonstrate that the essential ingredients of the alleged offences are not made out. The dispute between the parties is civil in nature and is intertwined with ongoing litigation relating to property abroad, thereby indicating *mala-fide* intent behind the registration of the FIR. The petitioner is a non-resident Indian having deep roots in society and is not likely to abscond or misuse the concession of bail. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required.

3. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the present petition and submits that the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature. As per the FIR as well as the material collected during investigation, the petitioner, in connivance with his co-accused, induced the complainant on the false pretext of sending his nephew abroad and thereby dishonestly extracted a substantial amount from him. A total amount of Rs.25,00,000/- was paid by the complainant, out of which a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- was specifically handed over to the present petitioner in cash along with a coloured copy of the passport of the nephew of the complainant. The remaining amount was routed through bank accounts of



co-accused persons, clearly reflecting a concerted and pre-planned act. Despite receiving the amount, neither was the promise fulfilled nor was the money returned. The role of the petitioner is clearly discernible from the record and his custodial interrogation is necessary to unearth the larger conspiracy and the flow of money. In view of the seriousness of the allegations and the manner in which the offence has been committed, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record, this Court finds that the present is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, the contention of the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated and that no amount was received by him is not borne out from the record at this stage, as there are specific and categorical allegations in the FIR that the petitioner had taken a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- in cash from the complainant along with a coloured copy of the passport of the nephew of the complainant. Such allegations, *prima-facie*, indicate active participation of the petitioner in the commission of the offence and cannot be brushed aside merely on the basis of his plea of absence from India or the civil nature of the dispute; the argument regarding delay in registration of the FIR and alleged inconsistencies are matters of trial and do not, at this stage, dilute the seriousness of the accusations, rather, the nature of the allegations reflects a well-orchestrated scheme to cheat the complainant on the pretext of facilitating foreign travel. Considering the gravity of the offence, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, and the requirement of custodial interrogation to ascertain the complete chain of events and involvement of



other persons, this Court is of the considered view that no ground is made out for grant of anticipatory bail; accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

5. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

20.04.2026

neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>